DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 400 892 JC 960 661

TITLE	Committee on the Future of Arizona Community Colleges: Report on the Charrette.
INSTITUTION	Arizona Association of District Governing Boards, Phoenix.; Arizona Community Coll. Presidents Council, Phoenix.; Arizona State Board of Directors for Community Colleges, Phoenix.
PUB DATE	Sep 96
NOTE	26p.; Prepared by the Committee on the Future of Arizona Community Colleges.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Change Strategies; *College Planning; *Community Colleges; Educational Needs; *Institutional Mission; *Organizational Development; *Participative Decision Making; Policy Formation; Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Arizona; *Charrettes

ABSTRACT

From September 4 to 6, 1996, the Committee on the Future of Arizona Community Colleges conducted a charrette, or structured decision-making process designed to develop consensus, to provide recommendations for improving Arizona's community colleges. In developing the charrette, the Committee issued a request for ideas in March 1996 and selected 79 participants from the state's community colleges, community groups, universities, and state government. Following an opening panel discussion, participants were divided into six groups, discussing a series of issues and presenting results to a six-person jury. Issues addressed in the process included the mission of the Arizona community colleges, methods for developing a better understanding of and appreciation for community colleges, recommendations regarding the future of teaching and learning in the colleges, and strategies for strengthening the working relationships within the college system. The following themes emerged from the discussions: (1) community colleges should position themselves as learning providers of first choice; (2) they should retain local control with statewide coordination; (3) operational paradigms must change; (4) the importance of collaboration to break down barriers of "turf" and protectionism; (5) the need for faculty, staff, and resource development to study alternatives and to propose a rational system to finance Arizona Community Colleges; (6) the importance of providing services for diverse learners; and (7) the colleges should build on strength and celebrate successes. Summaries of panel presentations and small group reports and a list of participants are appended. (HAA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 400 892

Committee on The Future of Arizona Community Colleges

Report on the Charrette

September 4-6, 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Puyear

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

JC 960 661

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON THE FUTURE OF ARIZONA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Report on the Charrette

Conducted on September 4 - 6, 1996

Committee on the Future of Arizona Community Colleges

The Committee on the Future of Arizona Community Colleges (Committee) is a group sponsored jointly by the Arizona Association of District Governing Boards (AADGB), the Arizona Community College Presidents' Council (ACCPC), and the State Board of Directors for Community Colleges of Arizona (State Board). The Committee planned and convened the Charrette.

The Charrette

A Charrette is a structured decision-making process designed to develop consensuses on predefined goals among the members of a large group.

> ***Goal of the Charrette.*** *The goal of this Charrette is to provide specific recommendations regarding how the mission, organization, practices and instruction of Arizona Community Colleges should be modified to best meet the needs of the citizens of the state during the first decades of the twenty-first century.*

Procedure

- ***Request for Ideas.*** In March 1996, the Committee issued a "Request for Ideas" which was disseminated throughout the community college system and to the university liaison representatives. In response, the Committee received 62 papers and articles from a variety of sources. Community college faculties and administrators, university professors and students, governing board members, and state-level administrators were among the contributors. Each Charrette participant received a copy of all responses prior to the event.
- ***Selection of Charrette Participants.*** Each Arizona community college was requested to sponsor five participants. In addition, invitations to participate were extended through such groups as the Arizona Tax Research Association Board of Directors and other community leadership groups, and to selected individuals from the universities and state government. Seventy-nine individuals participated

in the Charrette: community college students, faculty, staff and administrators; community college district governing board and state board members; university representatives; state government representatives; and community representatives. *(See Appendix C for a list of Charrette participants.)*

- ***Panel Presentation.*** At the beginning of the Charrette, a panel presented a discussion of issues related to the future of Arizona community colleges. The panel presentation, conducted at the Scottsdale Community College Performing Arts Center, was also attended by a number of education and community leaders interested in the future of Arizona who could not participate in the Charrette due to schedule constraints.

  Dr. Dale Parnell, former President of the American Association of Community Colleges, served as Charrette Facilitator and Panel Moderator; Dr. Rufus Glasper, Vice Chancellor for Business Services of the Maricopa Community College District, discussed financial challenges expected in the future; Mr. Samuel Leiken, Director of Public Policy and Government Relations, Council for Adult and Experiential Learning, discussed issues related to workforce preparation; Dr. Doreen Dailey, President, Yavapai College, and Mr. Tom Hassler, Dean of Information Services and Institutional Research, Northland Pioneer College, jointly discussed issues related to mission, with an emphasis on distance education and responsiveness to learner needs.

  After the panel's presentations and a period for questions and answers and discussion, the Charrette participants moved to the Franciscan Renewal Center in Scottsdale for the remainder of the activities. *(See Appendix A for a summary of the panel presentations.)*

- ***Charrette Process.*** After a brief opening statement by the facilitator, participants were randomly divided into six groups to consider the first question. After a period of about forty-five minutes, the groups reassembled. A jury of six individuals was seated. Each small group, in turn, made its presentation on the assigned question. The group was first questioned by the jury members, and then by the members of the other groups. After the group presentations, the next question was posed, the participants returned to their small groups for discussion, and the cycle was repeated.

  The cycles of small group discussion, presentation to jury and large group, and probing discussion were continued from Wednesday evening until noon on Friday. Participants were reassigned creating new groups and a new jury was selected at midpoint in the process to provide variety and to give each participant the opportunity to have the small-group experience with different people.

  The Charrette group addressed the following questions:

  1. What should be the mission of Arizona Community Colleges in the first decades of the 21st century?
  2. How will Arizona community colleges develop a better understanding of and appreciation for community colleges?
  3. What do you recommend about the future of teaching and learning in Arizona community colleges?
  4. How can we strengthen the working relationships within Arizona's system of community colleges? Strengths? Weaknesses? Recommendations?

5. How can we improve the sense of community in our colleges, particularly among part-time students and part-time faculty and staff?
6. What would be the key elements of any new funding system for Arizona community colleges?
7. What recommendations do you have about governance of Arizona's Community Colleges?

(See Appendix B for a summary of the individual group reports on each question.)

Emerging Themes

A number of themes pervaded the discussions of the Charrette group. These themes and the recommendations related to them are discussed below.

1. Community Colleges as Learning Providers of First Choice

The first and most pervasive theme that emerged from the Charrette was that community colleges should position themselves to be the learning providers of first choice for individuals, businesses, governmental agencies, and any others concerned with the training or education of adults. This goal has many implications, including the following:

a. Learning experiences at community colleges must be competency-based. No longer will it be useful to describe learning experiences in terms of "seat time." While the concept of credit hours will likely remain a useful measure for transfer courses for some time, measurable competencies must become the way in which community colleges describe and assess learning experiences.

b. Community colleges must become brokers of learning experiences based on learner needs. Community colleges must assist learners in designing a personal learning plan based not only on the offerings of the individual college, but also upon all learning opportunities available to the learner from whatever source.

c. Community colleges must become assessment centers for the evaluation and certification of prior knowledge. Repeating instruction in material already learned is wasteful for both the individual and for society. Community colleges can provide a valuable service by conducting accurate assessment and certification of prior learning to ensure appropriate placement in the programs of the college. The certification of prior learning must be acceptable for transfer as well as occupational programs.

d. Community colleges should provide affordable, flexible learning opportunities. Community colleges must provide learning opportunities in smaller increments and on a more flexible schedule. Many students will be adults returning to college for specific job-related skills. The pattern of three credit-hour courses provided in fourteen- to sixteen-week semesters is often inconsistent with the needs of these learners.

e. Arizona community colleges and universities must continue to refine and simplify the transfer process. In Arizona, the public universities interface directly with comprehensive community colleges. Arizona's population is rapidly increasing, as is the number of persons seeking a college education. The universities are nearing capacity, and the new university campuses now under development are not expected to have the capacity to meet the demand. Community colleges will have to assume the additional load: good transfer articulation is essential. While Arizona already has an excellent foundation for transfer articulation, and transfer is working well in a number of areas, there are still troublesome issues that must be addressed. A major task force of university and community college leaders is currently addressing these issues.

f. Community colleges will use technology to reach learners who could not previously be served. Technology that is rapidly becoming more available and affordable allows community colleges to serve learners where and when they desire to learn. Examples of such technology include interactive television, the Internet, CD-ROM, and learning modules of print, audio cassette, and video cassette materials. The use of distance learning and carefully designed learning modules will rapidly become the instructional mode of choice for many adult learners.

g. Community colleges should expand their offerings to include the Bachelor of Applied Science degree. The Bachelor of Applied Science (or Bachelor of Technology, or other similar titles) is an applied degree and differs from the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science offered by Arizona's universities. It is primarily designed to meet the ever-increasing demand for highly skilled workers in a variety of fields. These programs are not presently available in Arizona institutions; community colleges are best positioned to provide them.

2. *Local Control with Statewide Coordination*

Perhaps no theme was more consistently stated than that Arizona community colleges must remain under local control. Yet there was also a clear understanding that certain functions require state-level coordination and consistency. The group identified some matters that would be coordinated most effectively at the state level.

a. Strategic leadership. The Charrette and the Arizona Learning Systems initiatives are examples of state-level leadership and coordination. Such leadership is necessary to enable the community colleges to plan for and face future-oriented issues of common interest.

b. Data collection and analysis. The lack of good, consistent information on Arizona community college programs and students was cited as a major weakness in the current system. State-level data collection and analysis was seen as an urgent need.

c. Accountability reporting. Accountability reporting is related to data collection and analysis. Community colleges must develop and routinely provide a comprehensive "report card" to the citizens, the Legislature, and to governmental agencies that relate to community colleges.

d. Transfer articulation. Transfer articulation is presently excellent in some areas and unsatisfactory in others. A strong, unified approach to transfer articulation with the universities was seen as an essential state level function.

e. Legislative relations. The tendency of community colleges to develop factions based on size, population, or other factors was seen as ultimately destructive to the long-term best interests of all. A unified approach to the Legislature by community colleges was listed as one of the urgent needs of the system.

f. Marketing/image. The concept of a marketing "umbrella" was recommended. A broad unifying theme would be developed for the entire state system, within which each community college would provide its own individualized message, tailored to its local community.

3. *Changing Paradigms*

The "picture in our mind" about how community colleges operate must change if community colleges are to reach their potential in the coming decades. Funding and enrollment reporting models are based on a combination of old public school and university reporting standards that do not reflect the present reality and are inhibitors to needed reform in community college operations.

a. The semester as the primary period of instruction. When the community college system in Arizona was established in the early 1960s, courses were almost universally one or more semesters in length and credit hours were useful units of measure. Universities still adhere to this practice. Increasingly, community college learning experiences are of variable (shorter) length and learning experiences can begin throughout the year. A funding or reporting model that takes a snapshot of enrollment on the 45th day of each semester—the current model—gives an inadequate and distorted picture of community college operations. Therefore, this model must be changed to more effectively reflect the dynamic, continuous enrollment in community college learning activities.

b. Full Time Student Equivalent (FTSE) as the basis of funding. Full time student equivalent (30 semester credit hours) has been the primary measure of community college performance for funding and other purposes from the beginning of the system. At that time most students attended full time, most courses were a semester in length, and other services were more or less proportional to FTSE. Changing educational needs of society demand a different delivery system which leads to the need for different funding bases. FTSE is still a reasonable measure of the amount of credit instruction. Headcount is a much better measure of the effort and resources required for student and auxiliary services. Other measures and funding mechanisms, unrelated to overall enrollment, are needed for other services provided by community colleges.

c. The distinction between credit and credit-free instruction. The assumption ("picture in the mind") that credit-free instruction is recreational or avocational in nature and therefore should be self-supporting is no longer valid. For many types of employee enhancement programs the

Continuing Education Unit (CEU) is the measurement of choice. An important component of the mission of community colleges is to offer instruction for CEU's or some other credit-free mode. The funding and enrollment-reporting models need to reflect this reality.

4. *Collaboration*

The word "collaboration" appears more often than any other word in the notes on the Charrette, reflecting the growing realization that community colleges must work with others if they are to accomplish their mission. This collaboration must serve to break down barriers of "turf" and protectionism, and it demands mutual respect among those involved.

Community colleges must collaborate with—among others:

- business and industry groups in order to provide facilities for occupational programs.
- secondary and middle schools to enhance secondary school retention and to reduce the need for remediation at the community college level.
- universities and private postsecondary institutions to provide effective transfer opportunities for community college students. *The ongoing development of upper division opportunities on community college campuses through such programs as NAU/Yuma and other NAU partnerships is a striking example of this type of collaboration.*
- one another to avoid duplication and to provide mutual support. *The Arizona Learning Systems initiative is a current example of this type of collaboration. In this instance, course development, learning delivery strategies, and around-the-clock student services can only be effectively accomplished by statewide collaboration and sharing.*

5. *Faculty and Staff Development*

Faculty and staff development is no longer merely desirable; it is an essential strategy to bring about the educational reforms necessary to meet the challenges noted in earlier themes. Continuous learning opportunities, and learning requirements, must be provided if faculty and staff are to become expert in learning strategies. Developing a sense of "community" is essential to fulfillment of their potential. Faculty and staff development is not a one-time retraining task: it is a perpetual learning requirement.

Two areas of concentration may dominate the faculty and staff development for the foreseeable future:

a. Learning to deal with technology and new learning strategies. As technology takes its place as an integral part of the teaching and learning process, and as competency-based learning becomes the standard, community colleges will assume a growing obligation to assist both

full-time and part-time faculty and staff in developing their skills in these areas.

b. Developing a sense of "community" within the faculty and staff. Community colleges must find ways to instill a stronger sense of community not only among the full-time faculty and staff who experience the pressures of workloads, but also among the part-time or visiting faculty. It is equally as important to instill pride of ownership among those part-time faculty and staff who serve students and help to maintain the institution. A thoughtful program of faculty and staff development is an essential component of such a plan.

6. *Finances and Resource Development*

Charrette participants expressed uncertainty about the financing of Arizona's community colleges in the coming years. The historic reliance on local property taxes is threatened by recent initiatives to eliminate or radically reduce property taxes; such measures have been taken in other states. The disparities in revenue generated by local property taxes among different districts for public school funding has come under constitutional review; the same principles may well be applied to community colleges. The participants determined a compelling and urgent need to study alternatives and to propose a rational system to finance Arizona community colleges.

The group recommended that the Arizona community colleges take the following actions:

a. Learn from the experiences of other states. Arizona community colleges should establish a statewide task force to study the strategies employed by the other states that have recently experienced a reduction or abolition of property taxes as a primary revenue source. The effectiveness of the various strategies, and the effects on the community colleges of those states should be studied objectively.

b. Prepare a model to explore the effects of various changes on the different districts. The task force described above, or another group, should prepare a computerized model to explore the effects of possible changes in property taxes on the various community college districts of the state. The model needs to be sufficiently sophisticated to model the effects of changes in specific tax sectors (e.g., mines, utilities, homes, etc.). This model should be used in the development of the proposal for state funding of community colleges.

c. Explore ways to diversify the tax base for community colleges. Finally, the study should explore alternatives to property taxes with a goal of diversifying the sources of community college funding to impart stability and predictability.

7. *Services for Diverse Learners*

Arizona's community colleges will continue to serve students from a kaleidoscope of backgrounds and experiences. As the communities served become even more diverse, it is essential that the

community college be prepared to provide new as well as continuing services to meet the changing needs of the broad array of learners who choose to enroll.

a. Student services for distance learners. The current menu and delivery methods for student support will no longer be adequate or appropriate. Instead, technology and new learning patterns will mandate changes and additions to the list of services needed to support this new type of learner. Orientation, counseling, advising, mentoring, career development, learning resources, and other crucial learner support services will need to change dramatically.

b. Availability of support services at extended hours and remote locations. Community colleges and their leaders will find themselves uniquely challenged to provide many support services around the clock which learners will be able to easily access from home, workplace, or other off-campus locations.

8. *Building On Strengths; Celebrating Successes*

Arizona's community colleges have a nationwide reputation for excellence and innovation. Maricopa is renowned for its "cutting edge leadership," and for such educational initiatives as "women returning to education" and "service learning." Pima was established as a "model community college" and has gained an enviable reputation for educational leadership. Mohave was a pioneer in distance learning and data communication via microwave television. The partnership between Arizona Western College and NAU/Yuma is still a leading edge innovation. Many other examples are available.

As the system approaches its fifth decade of service to Arizona and Arizonans, it is appropriate that Arizona community colleges acknowledge and celebrate their inspiring successes, and build on them to meet the crucial challenges of the 21st Century. As cooperating and collaborating partners, Arizona community colleges can develop a new synergy in education that will carry them beyond the sum total of the capacity of individual institutions, elevating them to new heights of service.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF PANEL PRESENTATIONS

Panel Moderator—Dr. Dale Parnell

Financial Challenges Expected in the Future

Rufus Glasper

(Vice Chancellor for Business Services, MCCCD)

- Funding is the most visible challenge facing higher education institutions.
- Major concerns of legislative and educational leaders are (1)increases in educational spending, and (2) the subsequent decreases in student access and equity of opportunity possible remedies may generate.
- The funding issue is viewed in isolation: solutions to this challenge are related to the evolving vision and mission of Arizona's community colleges and their interrelationship with other elements of higher education.

We know that:

- Arizona is one of the three fastest growing states
- Public funds for higher education are uncertain; alternatives need to be identified.
- Federal policymakers continue to shift funding to state and local levels, requiring students to shoulder a greater portion of the burden.
- Arizona appropriated more funds to community colleges in FY 97 than in FY 96, although state aid, as a percentage of revenue, is declining.
- Arizona's community colleges will likely experience substantial operating cost increases as enrollments grow and as additional capital expenditures are required to accommodate them.
- State investment in new community college campuses and supporting infrastructures will likely be minimal in the foreseeable future.
- Because policymakers are reluctant to increase property taxes, and governing boards are reluctant to increase tuition, a shift to the sales tax is being discussed by some legislative leaders.
- Funding formula revisions may well change the distribution of community college revenues.
- Some community college leaders believe a redefinition of the funding formula from FTSE to headcount would more reasonably match the true cost of service to students.
- A large majority of states provide grants—such as "need-based" grants and vouchers to and contract with private, non-profit higher education institutions.
- Higher education does not appear to be price-sensitive; unlike private industry, it historically has absorbed new technologies without improving its production.

Our Goal—Reduce the reliance on public funds.

- Increase entrepreneurship and encourage competition.
- Support a postsecondary education voucher program.
- Base funding on outcomes and accountability.
- Partner with business and industry.
- Foster community collaboration, establish community/business/industry collectives as advisory groups, and maximize linkages with foundations.
- Share educational resources with a variety of political subdivisions.
- Develop alternative educational delivery systems independent of the "brick and mortar" paradigm.
- Identify possible limitations.

A Guide for Charrette Discussions

- How will community colleges provide greater student choice?
- Does funding a statewide community system require equity?
- How will technology redefine current statewide systems?
  - Are geographic boundaries irrelevant given today's technology?

- Should common courses be offered through the information highway?

Thoughts in Closing

- The future of the community college will be based on new paradigms. Our missions must reflect our visions for the 21st Century.
- Maricopa is exploring the concepts of Systems Thinking in a learning organization, based on the work of Ackoff and Senge, to develop an understanding of the forces and interrelationships that shape the behaviors of the District, the State, and all of Higher Education.

Workforce Preparation

Samuel Leiken

(Director of Public Policy and Government Relations, Council for Adult and Experiential Learning-CAEL)

- The 90s are somewhat consumer-dominated and centered.
- Look at the customers. What are their needs and expectations?
- Businesses believe that they have less money for training and education; employers have to be sold on the idea that an investment in education will have a beneficial return.
- Very few states have funds to underwrite the training of existing companies and their workers.
- Community colleges need to think about ways they can assist business in changing its work environment to become more effective in creating goods/services.
- Adult worker retraining suffers from: a lack of funds, a lack of confidence, a lack of thoughtful personal goals.
- Community colleges could serve community catalysts for learning—Sinclair and Whatcom are examples.

Recommendations:

- Community colleges should consider acting as a catalyst for learning in their communities—serving as a 'hub' for the learning system.
- Community colleges should assume a major role in influencing legislation and in stimulating change.
- The establishment of Individual Learning Accounts—individual fund accounts set up by employees and contributed to by both the employee and his/her employer—would help families meet rising educational costs.
- Community colleges must achieve better assessment and devote more attention to learning outcomes.
- Community colleges must developing new definitions of quality.

Mission, Distance Education, and Responsiveness toLearner Needs

Tom Hasseler

(Dean of Information Services and Institutional Research, Northland Pioneer College)

- Community colleges need to look at building "virtual communities."
- No longer do institutions have a corner on the local learning market. Local learning franchises are gone!
- Today's multimedia provides a vehicle for the customization of learning methodologies.
- The rate of technological change is increasing.
- The "glut" of data is so great: we are being overwhelmed by it to the point that we do not know which data are important and which are not.
- Certification of some information systems is not available from educational institutions, but instead from the companies that have developed them.
- The practice of "telecommuting" is increasing in today's workplace.
- Learning is becoming "perpetual" and is no longer time-bound.

Challenges Facing Education

- Given all the opportunities and learning environment changes, how are we going to change the institution?—How are we going to pay for it?

Mission, Distance Education, and Responsiveness to Learner Needs

Dr. Doreen Dailey
(President, Yavapai College)

- The emerging mission of the community college is supported by two goals:
  (1) to produce learning, and
  (2) to build community.
- Community colleges should be brokers of learning opportunities.
- Technology may impact and enhance the teaching/learning relationship and stimulate opportunities locally for the community college (1) to connect with high schools, (2) to connect with our communities, and (3) to connect with businesses.
- Time is the learner's most precious commodity.
- The Seven C's:
  - Challenges
  - Choice
  - Connections
  - Competencies
  - Content...Look at the information being provided to the learner--what's its "shelf life"
  - Community...(virtual communities)
  - Change...Network scholarship using computers will change learning. Learning experiences will change in type and variety. Student services will change in format, time, and location. Brokering learning opportunities will become central to the community college's role.

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY OF SMALL GROUP REPORTS

Each small group developed a report with respect to each question. These reports are summarized below, arranged by question and by group.

Question #1: What should be the mission of Arizona Community Colleges in the first decades of the 21st Century?

Group #1

...to meet the needs of its community of diverse learners using resources creatively and collaboratively to provide innovative, responsive, quality educational opportunities

Group #2

...to prepare today's learner for tomorrow's world: anywhere, any time, any place, affordable — (we are in the business of human development through learning)

Group #3

Arizona community colleges are learning centers that assist individuals and diverse communities to adapt successfully to personal, social, economic and environmental changes

Group #4

The mission of Arizona community colleges is to develop and certify the capacities of our citizens to be self-sufficient and contribute to the development of healthy and prosperous communities.

Values that drove this mission statement:

- Focus on ends, not means
- Community based
- Learner centered
- Recognize learning regardless or origin
- Forward looking, leadership role
- Value open door access
- Value collaboration with others
- Recognize and value unique niches and community resources
- Democratizing institutions that are flexible and responsive
- Good steward of public resources
- We have the courage to change based on internal and external assessment

Group #5

The mission of the Arizona community colleges is to provide affordable, flexible access to educational opportunities for multiple populations by instilling a sense of community and bridging the continuum of learning.

Group #6

The dynamic community college of the future will be the learning resource of choice that anticipates and responds to the needs of the communities it serves.

Questions #2: How will Arizona community colleges develop a better understanding of and appreciation for community colleges?

Group #1

- Through a collaborative (interactive) process, identify target markets (high schools, business, students, faculty and staff, community leaders, elected officials, universities) — what are their perceived notions of the community college?
- Develop a marketing plan (product, place, promotion, price) including measurable outcomes and an evaluation methodology (local/regional/state levels)
- Aggressively focus on the "image" of the community college (internal and external) — endorsements; advertising

Group #2

- Craft and identity an image
  - what makes each college unique?
  - publicize outcomes
  - (WE) Students, alumni, faculty, staff
- Make the college integral to the community. (Community beyond geographical boundaries)
  - sharing facilities, resources, expertise, services
  - market and promote the value of our products (associate degrees)
  - articulate
- Make the community integral to the college.
  - partnerships — business, education, government, foundations
  - advisory
  - part of the decision making - include community

Group #3

- Hire an advertising agency to develop a statewide thematic approach for community colleges and to run generic message during non-FTSE generating periods. (Car manufacturer/car dealer advertising analogy cited)
- Identify and develop informational programming for five target audiences:
  - policy makers
  - general public
  - students and possible students
  - K-12
  - internal audience
- Make public relations a priority to communicate community college successes

Group #4

- Identify and understand who we are
- Understand public perception (support and expectations) of community colleges and be responsive
- Develop a marketing plan
  - plan by expert in marketing
  - builds on positive perceptions
  - market past successes and future solutions
- Membership in civic organizations

Group #5

- Cultivate high profile public advocates for Arizona community colleges
- Develop system-wide professional marketing plan
- Mobilize community-based grass roots support for community colleges
- Capitalize on successful partnerships and collaborations

Group #6

- Establish and maintain working partnerships with public and private sectors
  - involve faculty and staff on community boards and organizations
  - listen and provide positive response
  - K-12 outreach
  - business outreach
- Foster community ownership of community colleges
  - student ambassadors
  - community colleges to parent groups, PTO's, business groups, CBO's
  - advertise — traditional media, web page, in-house networks
  - service learning
- Develop accountability outcomes measures and publicly communicate them
  - annual report card
  - celebrate and recognize associate degree
  - guaranteed associate degree
  - measurable and visible outcomes such as graduation, service learning, interactive community activities
  - celebrate staff

Question #3: What do you recommend about the future of teaching and learning in Arizona community colleges?

Group #1

- Rethinking
  - access (hours, place)
  - off site—your place, not mine
  - structure
  - bench marking other models
  - content collaboratively
  - delivery systems
  - academic and vocational and service integration (real world)
  - competency based rather than number of hours in class
- Retrain/Renew
  - Technology support staff
  - facilitative approach to teaching and learning
  - collaborative teaching development (high school

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

— Mohave example)
  - staff and professional development (both part-time and full-time)
- Reward
  - new compensation models
  - explore new modes of evaluations

Group #2

- Comprehensive faculty development to facilitate
  - authentic assessment of learning
  - thematic and integrated learning environment
  - balance between pedagogy and discipline
  - allowing and encouraging risk taking
- Enhancing learning with information technologies
  - global communication
  - changing our whole attitude about teaching and learning
- What should the role of leadership be relative to teaching and learning?

Group #3

- Focus on learning how to learn
- Focus on collaborative learning
- Focus on critical thinking:
  - analysis
  - synthesis
  - articulation—with a focus on evidence to support generalizations and conclusions

Group #4

- Comprehensive intake and ongoing assessment resulting in an individual educational plan which takes into account prior learning, learning style, personal, professional and educational goals and like circumstances
- In anticipation of changes in global environment we will develop and provide alternative delivery systems that address
  - immediacy of needs
  - change of technology
  - needs of individuals, community, etc.
  - systems to be competency based
- Training all employees (full- and part-time) to cope with changes in new delivery system and technology in order to be more effective partners in a diverse community

Group #5

- Utilizing technology yet maintaining personal touch
  - computer course from home, etc.
  - redefining personal touch
- Develop and deliver flexible curriculum
  - integrate courses across the curriculum
  - course modules
  - distance learning
- Incorporate employability skills into the learning opportunities
  - communication
  - humor
  - active listening
  - team building
  - conflict resolution
- Foster environment to encourage risk taking, innovation, and entrepreneurship
  - staff development
  - reassign time
  - "skunk works"

Group #6

- More distributive opportunities for learning
- Brokering educational opportunities and the community college baccalaureate
- Evolving instructional issues
  - move from "seat time" to competency based
  - instructional accountability
  - better articulation between educational entities (K-16)
  - comprehensive professional development

Question #4: How can we strengthen the working relationships within Arizona's system of community colleges?

Strengths, Weaknesses, Recommendations

Group #1

Strengths

- Are we a system?
- Legislative agenda
- Advocacy
- Local governance
- Competition
- Collaboration
- Potential for political influence and articulation

Weaknesses

- Are we a system?
- Competition
- Communication stays at board and CEO level and other level administrations, but not

at faculty level
- Funding system
- Lack of planning data
- Ignoring federal relationship

Recommendations
- To improve communication, put all governing board (local and State Board) minutes on the Web
- All Articulation Task Forces (ATFs) have a chat line for ongoing communication
- Need to resolve articulation issues (transfer of credits/ programs from community colleges to universities) with a statewide solution
- More consortium programs between districts
- Do a system-wide review of funding for community colleges, particularly since the state formula isn't operative and serious discussion of eliminating property taxes has occurred
- Present a more united front to Legislature on issues

Group #2
- Resource sharing upon recommendation of local districts
- Closer collaboration among faculty leaders across state (curriculum)
- State Board should be a coordinating council

Group #3

Strengths
- Manageable size (all of higher education)
- Good people
- NAU/Yuma (2+2's)
- Good telecommunications at the district level
- Local control (responsiveness)
- Good communications between districts
- Good training programs
- Good reputation nationally
- History doesn't bog us down
- Relatively innovative
- Responsive to community needs via community service

Deltas
- Uneven articulation between community colleges and universities
- Urban/rural split on funding and legislative initiatives
- Zero-sum thinking
- Limited communication from community college representatives on statewide committees and task forces, etc.
- Clarification of roles of system members
- Perception of local control by policy makers
- Perception that all community colleges are like Maricopa
- Not enough communication with K-12 and universities regarding competencies and curriculum development
- Not integrated at the state level in solving state problems; solving state issues
- Population distribution and some counties that are not being served

Recommendations
- Commit to ethic of support for statewide initiatives
- Proactive stance for dealing with agencies related to mission and other state issues
- Dialogue to resolve issues inhibiting an effective funding strategy

Group #4

Strengths
- Lots of programs in place
- Small — only a handshake away
- Support from the legislature
- Strength in numbers
- Good communication
- Good enabling legislation
- Lots of local autonomy
- Diversified programs
- Arizona operates with "goodwill"
- Strong leadership
- Strong resources
- Good community support

Weaknesses
- Articulation
- Limited resources
- Secondary school articulation
- Territorialism
- Lack of communication at program level
- Lack of interdistrict program sharing
- Lack of statewide academic community or exchange

Recommendations
- Build better networks — Web page
- Annual state wide community college meeting
- "Mother of all Articulation Conferences" (Deal with internal transfer first, then external)
- State Board should meet at different campuses.

Group #5

Strengths

- Articulation (some areas)
- Networking, collaboration among colleges
- Common numbering systems in math, biology
- Community based service
- Resources (staff, people, students)
- Economic development impact (return to the community)
- Accessible/affordable/flexible
- Number of students served

Weaknesses

- Articulation (some areas)
- Funding
- Number of students in developmental classes
- Lack of unity, e.g. funding
- Separation between vocational education and academic programs
- Statewide management system
- Marketing
- Statewide student cooperation
- Political leverage with state legislators
- Student retention

Recommendations

- Certification needs improvement
- Statewide student association
- System wide marketing plan
- United front with legislature
- Fund and implement statewide management information system
- Cultivate community college advocates
- Strengthen collaborative relationships (community colleges, K-12, business)

Group #6

Strengths

- Uniqueness of various community colleges around the state
- Autonomy — compared to top down centralized system
- Relatively small size
- Fills need for developmental education
- Low costs
- Flexibility
- Truly community-based — not a state system
- Influence policy/legislation — can talk directly to legislator
- Funding control

Weaknesses

- Certification of faculty
- Funding — FTSE — disincentive to cooperation
- State owns buildings — state should recognize responsibility to maintain them
- System of governance ill-defined
- Representatives of system to legislature speak with multiple voices
- Not achieved state wide focus on marketing, legislative activity, or fund raising

Recommendations

- Establish strong cooperative relationship
- Local control of faculty certification
- Redefine State Board role, advocacy, clearinghouse, programming, data sharing
- Need to rethink incentives, reward collaboration
- Lower division courses should be funded equally with university lower division courses
- Should increase recognition of the State Board — change title to State Board of Regents for Community Colleges

Question #5: How can we improve the sense of community in our colleges, particularly among part-time students and part-time faculty and staff?

Group #1

- Listen to faculty and students to hear what they want

With respect to part-time faculty

- Provide tuition waivers/vouchers
- Inclusion strategies development: faculty development/pay/professional growth/committees
- Continue orientation and communication/mentoring
- Support with facilities/tools/services/and technology

With respect to part-time students

- Develop student activities centering on part-time students
- Have gathering spaces throughout the campus and on-line for students to meet
- Communication of ongoing activities to all students

Group #2

- Provide more faculty and staff training
- More mentoring
- Provide social context
- Increase availability of services, e.g. child care flexibility of hours
- Greater promulgation of information about the availability of services, resources, etc.
- Emphasize the richness of the contributions of part time students (i.e., what they bring to the institution)
- Greater emphasis on active (collaborative) learning approaches
- More incentives, awards, recognitions for part time faculty

Group #3

With respect to part-time faculty:

- Staff development for part-time faculty
- Health benefits — allow part-time faculty to buy at group rate
- Provide tools to enhance effectiveness
- Enhance, by creating communication structures, the relationship between full-time and adjunct faculty
- Transfer credentialling process from state to local level

With respect to part-time students:

- Use ALS as a mechanism to allow students to access courses at different times
- Provide student services 7 days a week, 24 hours per day through collaboration of all community colleges
- Create statewide group health benefits pool for adjuncts to buy

Group #4

With respect to part-time faculty and staff

- Part-time faculty association (example MCCCD)
- Part-time orientation meetings for faculty and part-time staff—campus-wide and then individual department meetings
- Recognition — example: plaque or certificate, years of service
- Pay part-time faculty more money based on number of years of quality service
- More communication between Department Chairs and full-time faculty with part-time faculty and staff
- Focus on internal customer service skills for part-time faculty
- Strong support staff for part-time faculty and understanding their expectations and perspectives

With respect to part-time students

- Try to plan events that make it a family affair! Examples: Christmas - Santa, Halloween
- Review the registration and enrollment
- For the majority, leave them alone, they don't want it. Have no time.
- Look to the teacher for the social aspect
- Give them all the benefits that a fill-time student has
- Look at each target market

In general

- College and the cite — value of the college to the city; strengthen ties
- Student orientation
- Alumni association

Group #5

With respect to part-time faculty

- Participation in professional development activities
- Support services: e-mail accounts; mailbox; typing and copying
- Involvement in curriculum development and text-book selection
- Recognition
- Mentor

Community amongst part-time students

- Nontraditional scheduling of student support services
- Is physical facility student-friendly
- Publicizing services and activities — use multiple channels of communication

Group #6

Part-time faculty

- Conferences
- Stipends for staff development
- Tiered compensation for professional growth
- Incentives for serving on committees
- Office for e-mail accounts, work place
- Make hours of services fit part-time faculty
- Faculty mentoring

Part-time students

- Recognition of part-time students and faculty schedules
- Peer mentoring

- Creative incentives for participating in the learning community
- Incentives for serving on committees
- Make 'em comfortable: lounge; locker
- Make hours of services fit part-time student schedules
- Be user-friendly
- One-month follow-up after semester begins
- Prepare orientation video

Question #6: What would be the key elements of any new funding system for Arizona community colleges?

Group #1

- Cut costs
  - maximize use of all education resources
  - systems analyst
  - convert unused corporate facilities for education purposes as a condition of tax incentive agreement
  - moratorium on building if there are other buildings available
- Research
  - experiences of states which have reduced or eliminated property taxes
  - seek more private scholarship
  - pursue more grants, federal and private
  - set tuition and fees based on program costs
- Possible revenue sources
  - 1% on mineral extraction
  - 1% on power generation
  - 1% technology tax
  - 1% excise tax on entertainment, luxury
  - 1% corporate tax
  - toll roads
  - spend state surplus for education
- New funding system
  - 50% of state lottery to education
  - 1% sales tax on food to go to education
  - 1% tax on gasoline
- Public/private partnerships for equipment, etc.
- Cut maintenance costs by having state prisoners do the work

Group #2

- Local control
- Impact on potential students
- State coordinating board
- County levy sales tax
  - distributive process
  - doing our own equalization
- Capital "questions"

Group #3

- Fund Operations
  - enrollment-driven
  - outcome component
  - % up front
  - non-credit activities funded
  - limited centralized support functions (user evaluation and control)
- Fund Capital
  - statewide bond
  - increases due to increases in technology, instructional equipment
- Values that drive distribution

  Focus on students
  - access to choice of career options
  - choice of how they learn
  - cost access
  - access to contemporary equipment and technology
  - preparation

  Focus on the institution
  - equipment
  - maintenance
  - services
  - staff development
  - startups
- Or 1/4 treat like higher education (universities); perhaps 1/3 of whatever the universities receive
- Collaboration
- Tie tuition to formula related to minimum wage

Group #4

- Ideas for revenue
  - education tax
  - food tax
  - airline tax
  - toll tax
  - tobacco tax/luxury items
  - rental car tax
  - state income tax
  - Internet fee

- hotel tax
- federal increase

- Entrepreneurial Ideas
  - investment pool invested in equities for long-term capital
  - courseware
  - web services
  - lottery/gambling
  - subsidize with profitable business/industry programs
  - multimedia and materials sales
  - customized programs with higher fees
  - executive seminars and forums for profit
  - business partnerships (Microsoft, etc.)
  - contracting with government agencies (e.g., DOC, DES, Human Services, BIA)
  - privatize
  - retail opportunities
  - discount outlet
- Reduce expenses
  - eliminate duplications
  - reductions in general and administrative areas
- Tuition and fees
  - raise with ceiling

Group #5

- Develop an economic model based on historic data, including headcount, FTSE, capital (local and state), M & O, local taxes/rate, tuition, county sales, state sales, city tax, total income/tax/by county/state, and other factors 1/4 to determine what the effect on each community college would be
- Diversify the tax base
- Review alternative revenue methodologies — tax incentives, individuals
- Develop cost savings plans
- Help in earnest to solve high cost retraining problems
- Review mission
- Market local/regional/state levels

Group #6

Key Elements

- Stable (Base +)
- Dependable
- Consistent
- Fully fund the mission, i.e., ABE/GED; prior learning; recognize headcount; fund services; recognize value of all education — credit or credit-free
- Some incentive dollars for collaboration, results, entrepreneurship
- Eliminate "point in time" system (45th day); move to more flexible funding
- Need equity in funding
  - same dollars for lower division courses for universities and community colleges
  - remove inequities in percent of state dollars in districts
  - remove inequities in district taxing authorities
- Lift limits on unrelated business income tax issue
- Market-driven tuition/variable tuition
- Sales tax — 1% for education
- Lottery
- Change FTSE-based to headcount-based
- Consider urban/rural factors and both the economies and diseconomies of scale
- Develop contingency plans regarding elimination of property taxes, enrollment caps
- State-level scholarship support not tied to federal criteria
- Don't trade receiving more dollars for more constraints
- Reevaluate some of the regulations, e.g., won't fund someone repeating a course, service learning
- Shared funding with high schools for developmental/remedial classes in college (nationwide, 60% students here)
- Improved fund development (foundations, bake sales)
- Tax incentives for businesses that support community colleges; support employee development
- Make community colleges the provider of first choice for funds coming through the Department of Commerce, and other federal/state programs
- Personal tax-free scholarship account (similar to medical reimbursement account)

Question #7: What recommendations do you have about Governance of Arizona's Community Colleges?

Group #1

- Local responsibility
- State oversight, collaboration
- Certification a local responsibility — Hire as universities do

Group #2

- Locally elected, not appointed, local boards
- Smaller state board with emphasis on coordination rather than oversight
- Different board makeup — K-12 educators, local board, presidents
- Review of powers and duties

Group #3

- Local control
- Keep State Board - change name to one with more stature
- Review mission
  - decentralize faculty certification
  - centralize marketing, data collection, legislative contact
- Change local board to 7 members: 6 locally elected, 1 appointed by Governor (also serve on State Board), all vote

Group #4

- Like the current system with local boards and State Board
- Reexamine certification
- State Board to concentrate on coordination vs regulation

Group #5

- Boards need to focus on outcomes, not process
- One of the State Board member's primary roles should be advocates for system (all local community college districts) with governor and legislature
- Invite governor to visit with State Board once a year

Group #6

- Keep governance in local boards
- Redefine role of State Board as coordinating, advocacy, and strategic direction versus oversight
- Reexamine the makeup of the State Board in light of population and commitment to taxation for community college district — "No representation without taxation"

APPENDIX C

PARTICIPANTS IN THE CHARETTE

Mr. Ed Acuña
President, Desert Vista Campus
Pima County Community College District
5901 South Calle Santa Cruz
Tucson, AZ 85709-6000
(520) 295-5001
(520) 295-5050 (FAX)

Ms. Yolanda Anderson
Assistant to the President
Central Arizona College
8470 N. Overfield Road
Coolidge, AZ 85228
(520) 426-4214
(520) 426-4234 (FAX)

Mr. Dan Baertlein
District Governing Board Member
Coconino County Community College District
601 South 4th Street
Williams, AZ 860046
(520) 526-6091
(520) 526-1145 (FAX)

Ms. Joy Derksen Barton
114 E. 3rd Street
Winslow, AZ 86047
(520) 289-3171

Mr. T. O. Beach
Member
State Board of Directors for Community Colleges
6460 W. County 11
Yuma, AZ 85364
(520) 627-8208
(520) 726-4318 (FAX)

Mr. Bob Bendotti
Special Assistant to the President
Paradise Valley Community College
18401 N. 32nd Street
Phoenix, AZ 85032
(602) 493-2708

Dr. Quentin Bogart
2633 South Bala Drive
Tempe, AZ 85282
(602) 968-0977

Ms. Judy Boschult
Maricopa Faculty Association President
Maricopa County Community College District
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8114

Mr. Doyle Burke
Chair of Chairs
Mesa Community College
1833 W. Southern Avenue
Mesa, AZ 85202
(602) 461-7623

Dr. Donald Campbell
District Governing Board President
Maricopa County Community College District
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8889
(602) 731-8890 (FAX)

Ms. Patricia Case
Faculty Chair - Sociology
Rio Salado Community College
2323 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 517-8264
(602) 517-8289 (FAX)

Dr. Kathleen Church
Office of the Senior Vice President/Provost
Arizona State University
P.O. Box 872803
Tempe, AZ 85287-2803
(602) 965-1224
(602) 965-0785 (FAX)

Dr. Bruce Cordell
Professor/Chair -Div. of Science and Math
Arizona Western College
P.O. Box 929
Yuma, AZ 85366
(520) 344-7650

Dr. John Cordova
President
South Mountain Community College
7050 S. 24th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85040
(602) 243-8150
(602) 243-8108 (FAX)

Dr. Doreen Dailey
President
Yavapai College
1100 E. Sheldon Street
Prescott, AZ 86301
(520) 776-2022
(520) 776-2019 (FAX)

Dr. Arthur DeCabooter
President
Scottsdale Community College
9000 E. Chaparral Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
(602) 423- 6310
(602) 423-6063 (FAX)

Mr. Rick DeGraw
Executive Assistant to the Chancellor
Maricopa County Community College District
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8719
(602) 731-8120 (FAX)

Dr. Russell DeVriendt
Dean of Instruction
Arizona Western College
P.O. Box 929
Yuma, AZ 85366
(520) 344-7519

Mr. Mark Engle
Small Business Analyst
Northland Pioneer College
P.O. Box 610
Holbrook, AZ 86025
(520) 524-6111
(520) 524 2772 (FAX)

Dr. Paul Elsner
Chancellor
Maricopa County Community College District
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8100
(602) 731-8120 (FAX)

Dr. Dan Fishco
Vice President for Educational Services
Coconino Community College
3000 North Fourth Street, Suite 17
P.O. Box 80000
Flagstaff, AZ 86003-8000
(520) 527-2226
(520) 526-1821 (FAX)

Mrs. Thava Freedman
Vice Chair
State Board of Directors for Community Colleges
P.O. Box 700
Holbrook, AZ 86025
(520) 524-2537
(520) 524-2171 (FAX)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mr. Pete Gonzalez
Associate Director for Community and Governmental Relations
State Board of Directors for Community Colleges
3225 North Central Avenue, Suite 1220
Phoenix, AZ 85012
(602) 255-4037
(602) 279-3464 (FAX)

Dr. Bruce Groll
Research/Fiscal Analyst
Joint Legislative Budget Committee
1716 W. Adams
Phoenix, AZ 85007
(602) 542-5491

Dr. Charles Hall
President
Mohave County Community College District
1971 Jagerson Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401
(520) 757-0801
(520) 757-0836 (FAX)

Mr. David Hallstrom
5842 E. Red Wing Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85253
(602) 998-2766

Ms. Laura Helminski
Faculty Chair - Reading/ Communications
Rio Salado Community College
2323 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 517-8267
(602) 517-8289 (FAX)

Mrs. Pat Hill
Executive Director
ACCA
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8116
(602) 731-8090 (FAX)

Mr. Ron Hurle
District Governing Board Member
Navajo County Community College District
P.O. Box 753
Snowflake, AZ 85937
(520) 536-7623
(520) 524-6920 (FAX)

Dr. Robert Jensen
Chancellor
Pima County Community College District
4905C E. Broadway Blvd.
Tucson, AZ 85709-1005
(520) 748-4747
(520) 748-4990 (FAX)

Dr. Ed Johnson
Executive Director
Arizona Commission for Postsecondary Education
2020 N. Central Avenue, Suite 275
Phoenix, AZ 85004
(602) 229-2592
(602) 229-2599 (FAX)

Ms. Patti Johnson
Dean of Administrative Services
Chandler-Gilbert Community College
2626 E. Pecos Road
Chandler, AZ 85225
(602) 732-7015
(602) 732-7090 (FAX)

Mr. Chris Jones
President (Pima Chapter)
American Student Assoc. of Community Colleges
2202 W. Anklam Road
Tucson, AZ 85709-0265
(520) 884-6070
(520) 884-6071 (FAX)

Ms. Cassandra Kakar
Business/Industry Coordinator
Phoenix College
1202 W. Thomas Road
Phoenix, AZ 85013
(602) 955-5566
(602) 285-7599 (FAX)

Ms. Gina Kranitz
Dean of Administrative Services
Paradise Valley Community College
18401 N. 32nd Street
Phoenix, AZ 85032
(602) 493-2712
(602) 493-2978 (FAX)

Ms. Lynn LaBrie
Director of Economic Development Services
Arizona Western College Job Training Center
1314 South 4th Avenue, Suite D
Yuma, AZ 85366
(520) 783-9071
(540) 783-6981 (FAX)

Mr. Joseph Labuda
Librarian Educational Support Faculty
Pima County Community College District
2202 W. Anklam Road
Tucson, AZ 85709-0250
(520) 884-6821
(520) 884-6531 (FAX)

Dr. Annabelle Lewis
Page Campus Dean
Coconino County Community College District
P.O. Box 728
Page, AZ 86040
(520) 645-3987
(520) 645-3501 (FAX)

Mr. Tom Lombardo
Faculty Chair - Psychology
Rio Salado Community College
2323 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 517-8268
(602) 517-8129 (FAX)

Mr. Jack Lunsford
Director of Governmental Relations
Maricopa County Community College District
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8150
(602) 731-8620 (FAX)

Mr. Dan Main
District Governing Board Member
Yavapai County Community College District
1470 Purple Sage Drive
Chino Valley, AZ 86323
(520) 636-4894
(520) 445-2127 (FAX)

Dr. Kay Martens
South Mountain Community College
7050 S. 24th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85040
(602) 243-8031
(602) 243-8108 (FAX)

Ms. Robin McCord
Physics Faculty
Chandler-Gilbert Community College
2626 E. Pecos Road
Chandler, AZ 85225
(602) 732-7038
(602) 732-7009 (FAX)

Ms. Sharon McKinley
Assistant to the President
Arizona Western College
P.O. Box 929
Yuma, AZ 85366
(520) 726-1000
(520) 344-7730 (FAX)

Mr. Dean Miller
Arizona Tax Research Association
1814 W. Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85032
(602) 253-9121
(602) 253-6719 (FAX)

Ms. Karen Mills
Associate Dean of Academic Programs
Rio Salado Community College
2323 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 517-8101
(602) 517-8129 (FAX)

Ms. Saundra Minckley
President Senate
Mesa Community College
1833 W. Southern Avenue
Mesa, AZ 85202
(602) 461-7117
(602) 461-7681 (FAX)

Mrs. Lourdes Moreno-Jeong
Member
State Board of Directors for Community Colleges
664 N. Manzanita Drive
Nogales, AZ 85621
(520) 281-1593
(520) 761-4413 (FAX)

Dr. William Morrison
Director of Occupational Education
Cochise County Community College District
901 N. Colombo
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
(520) 515-5400
(520) 515-5250 (FAX)

Dr. Harry Muir
Dean of Instruction, Community Campus
Pima County Community College District
1901 N. Stone Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85709-5045
(520) 884-6412
(520) 884-6542 (FAX)

Ms. Mary K. Myers
Consultant
MKM Consulting
1605 E. Lockwood
Mesa, AZ 85203
(602) 835-0033
(602) 835-6665 (FAX)

Dr. Dale Parnell
3597 Begonia Drive, NW
Salem, OR 97304
(503) 581-2837

Ms. Francie Payne
Editor
Holbrook Tribune
P.O. Box L
Holbrook, AZ 86025
(520) 524-6203
(520) 524-3541 (FAX)

Ms. Yolanda Penley
Business Faculty
Chandler-Gilbert Community College
2626 E. Pecos Road
Chandler, AZ 85225
(602) 732-7042
(602) 732-7090 (FAX)

Mr. Ronald Peters
President
BPLW Architects
49 W. First Street, Suite 100
Mesa, AZ 85201
(602) 827-2759
(602) 827-0386 (FAX)

Mr. Joseph Policastro
Professor of Business
Central Arizona College
10812 E. Sleepyhollow Trail
Gold Canyon, AZ 85219
(602) 982-7261
(602) 426-4484 (FAX)

Ms. Beth Price
Director of Research & Grants
Central Arizona College
8470 N. Overfield Road
Coolidge, AZ 85228
(520) 426-4439
(520) 426-4234 (FAX)

Dr. Donald Puyear
Executive Director
State Board of Directors for Community Colleges
3225 North Central, Suite 1220
Phoenix, AZ 85012
(602) 255-4037
(602) 279-3464 (FAX)

Dr. Ken Roberts
South Mountain Community College
7050 S. 24th Street
Phoenix, AZ 85040
(602) 243-8032
(602) 243-8108 (FAX)

Mrs. Linda Rosenthal
District Governing Board Member
Maricopa County Community College District
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8889
(602) 731-8890 (FAX)

Mr. Daniel Russow
Professor, Division of Science and Math
Arizona Western College
P.O. Box 929
Yuma, AZ 85366
(520) 726-1000

Ms. Carol Scarafiotti
Dean of Instruction
Rio Salado Community College
2323 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 517-8135
(602) 517-8149 (FAX)

Ms. Rosemarie Schulz
Associate Dean of Educational Services
Pima County Community College District
1255 N. Stone Avenue
Tucson, AZ 85709-3050
(520) 884-6142
(520) 884-6129 (FAX)

Mr. John Schwantes
12309 Appaloosa Place
Scottsdale, AZ 85259
(602) 860-1289

Dr. Howard Simmons
Professor of Higher Education
Department of Higher and Adult Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 965-9144

Mr. Russell Smoldon
Salt River Project
P.O. Box 52025
PAB 211
Phoenix, AZ 85072-2025
(602) 236-2834
(602) 236-5950 (FAX)

Dr. Patricia Spakes
Arizona State University
4701 W. Thunderbird Road
Phoenix, AZ 85069
(602) 543-4524
(602) 543-7012 (FAX)

Dr. Frederick Stahl
Dean of Instruction
Paradise Valley Community College
18401 N. 32nd Street
Phoenix, AZ 85032
(602) 493-2701
(602) 493-2978 (FAX)

Dr. Virginia Stahl
Associate Dean of Students
Scottsdale Community College
9000 E. Chaparral Road
Scottsdale, AZ 85250
(602) 423-6139
(602) 423-6200 (FAX)

Ms. Nancy Stein
District Governing Board Member
Maricopa County Community College District
2411 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 731-8889
(602) 731-8890 (FAX)

Mr. Mike Tacha
Vice President
Mohave County Community College District
1971 Jagerson Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401
(520) 757-0802
(520) 757-0836 (FAX)

Ms. Barbara Thelander
Community Education Coordinator
Mesa Community College
1833 W. Southern Avenue
Mesa, AZ 85202
(602) 461-7501

Dr. Linda Thor
President
Rio Salado Community College
2323 West 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281
(602) 517-8140
(602) 517-8149 (FAX)

Mr. William Tilton
Vice President for Business Services
Mohave County Community College District
1971 Jagerson Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401
(520) 757-0843
(520) 757-0836 (FAX)

Dr. Phil Tullar
President
Coconino County Community College District
3000 North Fourth Street, Suite 17
P.O. Box 80000
Flagstaff, AZ 86003-8000
(520) 527-9766
(520) 522-2235 (FAX)

Dr. Mark von Destinon
Dean of Student Services
Cochise County Community College District
901 N. Colombo
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
(520) 515-5491
515-5452 (FAX)

Dr. Robin Walsh
Vice President Student Services
Mohave County Community College District
1971 Jagerson Avenue
Kingman, AZ 86401
(520) 757-0813
(520) 757-0836 (FAX)

Ms. Arnette Ward
President
Chandler-Gilbert Community College
2626 E. Pecos Road
Chandler, AZ 85225
(602) 732-7010
(602) 732-7090 (FAX)

Ms. Marcia Wojsko
Dean of Instruction, Sierra Vista Campus
Cochise County Community College District
901 N. Colombo
Sierra Vista, AZ 85635
(520) 515-5407
(520) 515-5406 (FAX)

The Committee on the Future of Arizona Community Colleges would like to thank the following for their gracious support of the Charette:

Intel
Southwest Gas Corporation
US West Communications
Arizona Public Service Company
Salt River Project
Dial Corporation
Motorola, Inc.

Printing: Courtesy SRP

Cover Design and Illustration, Layout:
Courtesy Pima Community College
Media Production and Publications